	1 9 1 01 22
1	
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
4	Case No. 12-12020-mg
5	x
6	In the Matter of:
7	
8	RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al.,
9	
10	Debtors.
11	
12	x
13	
14	United States Bankruptcy Court
15	One Bowling Green
16	New York, New York
17	
18	July 8, 2015
19	2:03 PM
20	
21	BEFORE:
22	HON. MARTIN GLENN
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
24	
25	
	eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    A P P E A R A N C E S : (ALL TELEPHONICALLY)
 3
    MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 4
          Attorneys for the Post-Effective Date Debtors,
 5
          the ResCap Liquidating Trust and the ResCap
 6
          Borrower Claims Trust
 7
           250 West 55th Street
 8
          York, NY 10019
 9
10
    BY: ERICA J. RICHARDS, ESQ.
11
          JORDAN A. WISHNEW, ESQ.
12
13
14
    ALSO PRESENT:
15
          DUNCAN K. ROBERTSON, Party Pro Se
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. This is Judge Glenn. We're on the record in Residential Capital, number 12-12020. This is a status conference regarding the ResCap Liquidating Trust's objection to the claims of Duncan Robertson.

Who's on the phone? For the Trust, first.

MS. RICHARDS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's Erica Richards and Jordan Wishnew from Morrison & Foerster on behalf of the ResCap Liquidating Trust.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Robertson, you're on the phone?
MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor. I am.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you being represented by counsel today?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, I'm appearing pro se.

THE COURT: Okay. So I have read the various letters from the Trust's counsel, Morrison & Foerster, and two letters from Mr. Robertson. When I issued my opinion and order on April 28, 2015 I had directed that the parties meet and confer regarding possible settlement and also with respect to discovery. That schedule, with the consent of the Court, was adjourned as the parties continued to try to reach settlement. I gather from the correspondence I've read the settlement efforts have been unsuccessful.

I also have two motions for reconsideration, one from each side. And so that's where things stand as of today, as I

1 understand it.

Mr. Wishnew or Mr. Richards, do you want to speak first?

MS. RICHARDS: Sure, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Richards. I'm sorry.

MS. RICHARDS: Erica Richards.

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. RICHARDS: So as set forth in the letter that we filed on June 25th, the Liquidating Trust remains open to settlement discussions with Mr. Robertson. We believe that his decision to terminate those discussions are based on a misunderstanding of the scope of the plan injunction, and so we're seeking, in the first instance, the Court's assistance and views on Mr. Robertson's ability to continue to prosecute claims against the debtors in other forums.

THE COURT: Well, outside -- Ms. Richards, Mr.

Robertson's latest letter -- which I saw for the first time today. I guess it was received on the 6th -- indicates that he's no longer seeking to prosecute state law claims against any of the debtors. Do you have that letter?

MS. RICHARDS: I have that letter, Your Honor. It wasn't entirely clear to us from reading the letter that he was saying he's no longer seeking to prosecute them, more that he's withdrawn his motion for default.

In the meantime, he also -- it doesn't say that he's

going to resume settlement discussions or that he's changed his 1 2 tune. THE COURT: Well, I don't force anybody to resume 3 4 settlement discussions, so -- but let me just deal first --Mr. Robertson, have you discontinued your efforts to 5 6 proceed in state court against any of the debtors? 7 MR. ROBERTSON: No, Your Honor. The only thing that 8 was withdrawn was the motion for default, and that was based 9 upon a technicality that the attorney representing Residential 10 Funding Company, LLC had stated that all these matters were stayed by order of the Court, and so nothing could go forward. 11 12 So until that was clarified we withdrew the motion. That's --13 THE COURT: Well --14 MR. ROBERTSON: -- the only extent to which it 15 stopped. THE COURT: Okay. Then, Ms. Richards, if you want to 16 17

THE COURT: Okay. Then, Ms. Richards, if you want to bring on a motion for contempt you can go ahead and do that, and without a pending motion I'm not going to give an advisory opinion. If you --

MR. ROBERTSON: I'm sorry if I -- I didn't mean to imply that, Your Honor.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, let me tell you how it is, Mr.

Robertson. The debtors' position, which has substantial support -- I'm not ruling today -- is that the confirmed plan precludes you from proceeding against any of the debtors in

anything outside of this court.

You're attempting to do that. When I ask you whether you have withdrawn that effort, you just told me that's not your intention, that you've only withdrawn the motion for a default judgment. And what I'm telling Ms. Richards is if the debtor wishes to raise the matter with this Court, they can do so by seeking to hold you and your lawyer in contempt.

And when they do that, you'll have a chance to respond, and I'll go ahead and rule. And if I rule against you, you have a substantial -- you and your attorney have a substantial risk of being held in contempt.

This issue of the effect of the plan injunction has been litigated before me in a number of other matters. There are a number of written opinions. I'm not ruling in the absence of an actual pending motion. I don't give advisory opinions.

You act at your risk. Let me put it that way, Mr. Robertson.

So, Ms. Richards, if you wish to proceed with a motion to hold Mr. Robertson and his lawyer in contempt, go ahead and do that. Get it on the Court's calendar. We'll get it teed up. Mr. Robertson will be required to appear here in person on any opposition to the motion. But let's get that teed up right away, because he's obviously indicated his intention to proceed against the debtor in state court.

MS. RICHARDS: Let --okay, Your Honor, under --

THE COURT: So that's -- that's the first. So I'm not ruling, because I don't have a concrete -- I know what's in the letters. I don't give advisory opinions. If you want to seek relief from the Court, you know how to do that.

The ordinary way of doing it is if somebody violates the plan injunction is to seek contempt. And if he's got a counsel do it, you seek contempt against both of them. And if he's right --

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- he'll win. And if he's not, he and his lawyer both have a substantial chance of being held in contempt with the appropriate sanctions for doing so.

If you want to -- in connection with your contempt motion, if you have expend -- if the Trust has expended legal fees in connection with the state court action, include that in a request for sanctions, and we'll proceed from there. So that's point number one.

Point number two, with respect to settlement, which I encourage, but has been unsuccessful, as far as I'm concerned, the time's over for that. And we're just going to move forward expeditiously.

I have the two motions for reconsideration. I've looked at them quickly. But what I'm going to do is I'm going to give each of you an opportunity to respond to the other's

motion for reconsideration.

So specifically I intend to enter an order today that each of you may file responses to the other's motion for reconsideration on or before 5 p.m. July 22, 2015. Responses may not exceed ten pages. No replies to these responses may be filed. The Court will not hold a hearing on the motions for reconsideration. The motions shall be deemed submitted as of the deadline for filing responses.

So we're going to -- that's the first thing we're going to clear away are the -- you'll both have a chance to file responses not exceeding ten pages.

All right. So the next thing, as far as I'm concerned, is I had asked that the parties meet and confer about a settlement -- about the discovery schedule. I don't fault anybody for trying to settle it, but it obviously hasn't settled, and I don't compel anybody to settle. But I'm going to set a deadline for the completion of all fact discovery of 5 p.m. September 4, 2015.

I'm not sure this is a matter that's going to call for expert discovery, but the order I enter will provide that expert discovery, if any, shall be completed by 5 p.m. October 5, 2015.

The order will provide, as my typical case management scheduling order does, that in the event of any discovery dispute the parties shall meet and confer in an effort to

resolve the dispute, and if they're unable to resolve the dispute, any party seeking the assistance of the Court shall, before filing any discovery motion, arrange for a conference with the Court with all parties or counsel involved in the dispute, and I'll endeavor to resolve the dispute without the filing of a motion.

And, Mr. Robertson, I typically -- if those requests come in, I usually have a telephone hearing within a day or two, but I expect the parties in good faith to try and resolve any disputes.

Next --

MR. ROBERTSON: All right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Next, I'm going to require that the parties submit a joint proposed pre-trial conference order, using the Court's template for such orders. And that appears on the Court's Web site under my chamber rules. And that's due on or before 5 p.m. October 19, 2015.

I'm scheduling trial on this contested matter for two days, October 26 and 27, 2015, to begin at 9 a.m. each day.

Mr. Robertson, you must be present in the courtroom for the trial.

I'm scheduling the next case management and scheduling conference in this contested matter for 2 p.m. September 14, 2015, which is after the close of fact discovery.

And, Mr. Robertson, you may appear at that conference

1	by telephone. You live in the State of Washington. Am I
2	correct?
3	MR. ROBERTSON: I live in the State of Oregon.
4	THE COURT: State of Oregon. Okay. So I try to
5	minimize the requirement of people being physically here. For
6	the case management and scheduling conference you can appear by
7	telephone, but for trial you have to be physically present in
8	the courtroom.
9	Now, I've seen from some of your papers you've been
10	consulting with an attorney. If you have any intention of
11	having an attorney appear for you in this matter you better do
12	so quickly. I'm not going to adjourn any of these dates that
13	I'm scheduling. We're just going to push forward.
14	MR. ROBERTSON: I might I do have a couple of
15	questions, Your Honor,
16	THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.
17	MR. ROBERTSON: if it's permitted.
18	THE COURT: Go ahead.
19	MR. ROBERTSON: First, I'd like to know what I'm in
20	contempt of. Was there an order
21	THE COURT: You're not in
22	MR. ROBERTSON: of this Court?
23	THE COURT: You're not in contempt of anything at the
24	moment, because I haven't held you in contempt, and I'm not
25	ruling in the abstract.

The counsel for the Trust has -- because I've seen this in the correspondence -- has pointed out to you repeatedly that the confirmed plan includes an injunction provision in it. And the Trust alleges that in your efforts to proceed against the debtors in state court you're violating that injunction. Violating of that injunction is punishable by contempt.

I don't have a properly filed motion before me seeking to hold you and your lawyer in contempt. I thought perhaps the issue had been eliminated. I guess I misread your letter, because it sounded to me that you understood that there had been an automatic stay until confirmation, and the plan injunction since confirmation, and that it precludes you from doing what you're attempting to do against any of the debtors.

It doesn't preclude you from proceeding against any nondebtor parties in the other action, but it does have an effect on what you can do with respect to any of the debtor parties.

I'm not ruling, because I don't have a properly filed motion in front of me, but I'm just making clear, the way that an injunction -- violation of an injunction is punishable by civil contempt.

I assume that if the trustee sticks to its guns it will file a motion to hold you and your lawyer in contempt for what you've been attempting to do in the state court action.

You'll have an opportunity to respond to that motion, and we'll

have a hearing. That I will require your personal appearance in court for, when that comes on for a hearing.

So no one has held you in contempt yet. That's what -- the issue that's been raised by the Trust in its letter. I thought that your most recent letter had basically -- without acknowledging whether the Trust was correct or not -- simply said you were going to withdraw any efforts to proceed against the debtors, but you've indicated to me that's not the case.

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, that's in part, and maybe I didn't make it clear in the letter or in my voicing here, but what we have withdrawn is attempts for anything other than real property rights. And as I understood it, those are permitted under the -- all the terms that have gone through, including the injuncted (sic) terms.

THE COURT: The debtor, as I understand it, doesn't -MR. ROBERTSON: If I'm incorrect, advise me.

THE COURT: Mr. Robertson -- well, maybe, Ms.

Richards, you could clarify this. Does the debtor have any interest in the property currently?

MS. RICHARDS: May understanding is we do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So what are you -- if they don't claim to have any interest in the property, how is it that you're proceeding against any of the debtors with respect to

the property?

The only thing that the supplemental servicing order had done was permit somebody in defense of an action by any of the debtors to foreclose -- was to assert defenses, nonmonetary defenses to foreclosure, okay? But I've been writing in numerous decisions since the debtors disposed of their servicing rights and others that a declaratory judgment, for example, against them is not proper, where they don't claim an interest. There's no title to quiet. There's no rights that they assert in any of your property. So if you're proceeding against them, it isn't going to be on the basis of a supplemental servicing order. But I'm not --

Look. I don't have a properly filed motion, but you just better understand you're, you know, based on this hearing today, you're on fair notice that if you continue to proceed against any of the debtors in state court, and they file a contempt motion, and they prevail on it -- I'm not ruling on it, but you better make sure you and your lawyer know what you're doing, because if you're wrong, the consequences will be serious. Okay?

That's not a threat. That's a statement. You can go read opinions of mine in connection with ResCap, and you'll see that that's the case. But if you think you have a good defense to a contempt, well, you'll assert it when they file their motion. But we're going to move -- we're moving.

Look, I don't force anybody to settle. Nothing that
I'm saying today precludes you from renewing your discussions
with the Trust to see whether you can resolve it. All I'm
doing today, it's clear both sides have had ample time to try
and resolve the matter by settlement. From the correspondence,
it's clear to me that's not happening, at least at this stage.

That means, from the Court's perspective, we move forward. I do have the two pending motions for reconsideration. I'm giving both of you a chance to respond to each other's motions. I'm not staying discovery while that goes forward. So I'm giving you -- there'll be a written order entered today with the dates that I provided orally, and that's how we're going to go forward.

So if you want to settle it, go ahead and settle it.

It's fine with me. I've given both sides an ample opportunity
to try and do that, but now that that has not happened, and
from the correspondence, at least from Mr. Robertson, it
doesn't appear it's going to happen.

Now, Mr. Robertson, let me just say, I'm not giving any advisory opinions about it. Whether you have -- you obviously have sued nondebtor defendants in your state court action.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

THE COURT: And I make absolutely no ruling with respect to any issue involving those nondebtor defendants.

There's no stay in effect as to them. I can't stop them from arguing that some order or decision that's been entered in this case has -- that they can assert it defensively. That's going to be for the Washington State Court to decide, not for me.

Okay?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

THE COURT: You and your lawyer -- you have a lawyer in that action. Is that right?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. So, but, you know, that's really -I have no jurisdiction over your claims against the nondebtor
defendants. I make no ruling with respect to it. I can't stop
them from asserting they want, and the court in Washington can
rule whether their objections are well taken or not. That's
not for me to decide.

MR. ROBERTSON: Understand, Your Honor. I will write a letter to the Morrison & Foerster here, and perhaps we can confer further with regard to the quiet title provisions in Washington, which I realize Your Honor has ruled on one issue of that, and it is, kind of, complicated, so that's why I did not respond to that. But actually a Washington quiet title action is in rem action. So it's not a case for controversy, and technically it is not properly placed in the federal court. And it's customary in Washington that all parties who have ever come in any title or interest be joined to any quiet title

action, so that the chain of title may be determined.

THE COURT: Mr. Robertson, you asserted a quiet title claim in your proof of claim. I sustained the objection to it.

MR. ROBERTSON: Right.

THE COURT: It's out of the case. Okay? That's not -- I will consider motions for reconsiderations, whatever, but the debtors and the Trust assert no interest in your property, okay? If you think you have a good quiet title claim against somebody else, go ahead and proceed in state court. It isn't going to be against the debtor. I have already -- that's one thing I did rule on, okay? If --

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, it's not against the debtor, Your Honor. That's a point.

THE COURT: They are not going -- look. I'm not ruling now. I'm just telling you, if they make a contempt motion, and you've been properly trying to force them to defend an action in Washington State Court, and if you're wrong, the consequences are going to be serious. Okay? That's not today's issue. But just understand. Don't come in, or your lawyer come in and argue you didn't understand what the Court's rulings have been, and therefore there shouldn't be a contempt ruling. Okay?

If you're right, good. You'll prevail. If you're wrong, you will be held in contempt, and your lawyer will be held in contempt, and there'll be consequences. So take the

1 chances, if that's what you want to do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not telling you that -- the Trust has to convince me that you have violated the plan injunction by proceeding in the fashion you have. But just understand the consequences if they're right and you're wrong.

MR. ROBERTSON: I do.

THE COURT: What discovery do you wish to take, Mr. Robertson?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, it would be principally with regard to discovering who actually had this loan and how it was involved in, because that's the basis of all authority for the actions of the claims that have been permitted to go forward.

THE COURT: Have you served any written discovery on the Trust at this point?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, I have not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. ROBERTSON: Because it's not been clear exactly where we are --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: -- in this matter.

THE COURT: That's fine. So both sides are, you know, whatever -- I don't know what discovery the Trust wants to take. Both sides are going to have to move forward promptly with discovery. So I will enter the written order today with this schedule. I encourage both sides to continue talking.

1	And that's where we'll go. I mean, your claims
2	against the debtor, in my court, are for monetary damages,
3	okay? One of the things you said in one or both of your
4	letters is that your lawyer had indicated to you that you would
5	prejudice your claims against the nondebtors if you resolved
6	the damage claims against the debtors. I'm not getting in the
7	middle of that. You'll either settle with the debtors or you
8	won't settle with the debtors. But we're not going to sit
9	back.
10	So the other thing tell me what's the status of
11	your Ninth Circuit appeal?
12	MR. ROBERTSON: It's still pending.
13	THE COURT: Well, is it fully briefed?
14	MR. ROBERTSON: It's been fully briefed, yes. It's
15	just we're awaiting the Ninth Circuit to it's not been
16	orally briefed.
17	THE COURT: There has not been oral argument yet.
18	MR. ROBERTSON: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay. When was it fully briefed? Do you
20	remember that?
21	MR. ROBERTSON: About two months ago.
22	THE COURT: Okay. The Ninth
23	MR. ROBERTSON: And the state court case has been
24	moved forward to what is it? March 20 or I'm sorry.
25	March I've got the date here. March 28, 2016

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: -- to permit that order to come in so that the cases may be heard simultaneously and together. And obviously it would be a great help if these claims could be heard in that same --

THE COURT: They're not.

MR. ROBERTSON: -- so Your Honor would --

THE COURT: You filed a proof of claim here. Your claims get adjudicated as part of the claims allowance process in this court, and that's what I'm going to do. That's what I'm setting -- saying a schedule in. If you don't settle it, they will be -- you know, I have still the motions for reconsideration. The Trust argues --

MR. ROBERTSON: Right.

THE COURT: -- that I would -- both sides argue my ruling was incorrect in some respects. And we'll see what comes out of that. So the order will have the dates I gave you for responding to each other's motion for reconsideration.

Some of this case remains, so no matter what. So discovery is going forward, and if we have to have a trial, we're going to have a trial. When we have --

MR. ROBERTSON: All right.

THE COURT: -- the September -- wait. Did I? Yes.

September 14, 2015, 2 p.m. New York time, case management and scheduling conference. I will give more guidance then about

```
what my procedures are applicable to trial.
 1
 2
            MR. ROBERTSON: All right.
 3
            THE COURT: Okay? Ms. Richards, anything else you
 4
    want to raise?
            MS. RICHARDS: No, Your Honor.
 5
            THE COURT: Ms. Richards, if the Trust decides to
 6
 7
    bring contempt, obviously talk with Mr. Robertson first, see
 8
    whether you can resolve -- hopefully you can resolve those
    issues. If he's intent on proceeding against the debtors in
 9
10
    state court, well, bring on your motion. Let's get it on a
11
    calendar.
12
            And, as I said, Mr. Robertson, you'll have to appear
13
    in person at that.
14
            MR. ROBERTSON: Understand, sir.
15
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. We're adjourned.
16
            MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
            MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
18
         (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 2:28 PM)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I, Hana Copperman, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. Hama Copperman HANA COPPERMAN AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET\*\*D 487 eScribers 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 New York, NY 10040 Date: July 9, 2015 

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net